<div align="center">**REMARKS**</div>

1.   Summary of the Office Action

In the Office action mailed April 30, 2007, the Examiner objected to the specification as allegedly not providing proper antecedent basis for claims 1 and 21. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, and 21 as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 12-21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,223,827 ("Bell") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,434,715 ("Anderson") and U.S. Pat. No. 6,502,131 ("Vaid").

2.   Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 12-21, and 23 are presently pending. Of these claims, 1, 8, 21 and 23 are in independent format, and the rest are in dependent format.

3.   Response to Objection of the Specification and the § 112 rejections of claims 1,4,5, and 21

The Examiner objected to the specification for allegedly failing to provide antecedent basis for claims 1 and 21, and specifically to the element of both claims of "wherein excluding an indication of the event from the event log display comprises excluding an indication of a normal event log entry to the event log display." Further, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, and 21 as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 for the same element of claims 1 and 21. See Office Action, pp. 2-3. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 21 to clarify that a "normal event log

entry" is "a log entry indicating the event does not correspond to the already recurring event."

The element of "excluding an indication of the event from the event log display comprises excluding an indication of a normal event log entry to the event log display" is supported generally throughout the specification, and specifically on pages 13-14 of the specification in describing steps 180, 190, and 200. This element is described in the specification by (a) the transfer of control between step 180 and step 200 where step 190 is omitted and (b) the action of step 200 in ignoring the event condition for presentation purposes.

The term "normal event log entry" is defined as a non-recurring event on at least page 14 of the specification in describing step 190 of the method shown in Figure 2. The specification describes step 190 as logging a normal event in the event log. Specifically, the specification states that "[a]t step 190, the program logs an event in the event log. **A normal event is logged for the monitored value at step 120, that is, it is not marked in the recurring state.**" (emphasis added).

In describing step 180, the specification on page 13, lines 16-21 states:

"If step 180 determines that the event condition has occurred more than n times in the preceding time period t2, then it is considered that the event remains a recurring event and the program proceeds to step 200. Alternatively, if step 180 determines that the event condition has not occurred more than n times in the preceding time period t2, the event is no longer considered to be a recurring event and the program proceeds to step 190."

As described above, at step 190, a normal event is logged, so if step 180 were to proceed to step 200 and bypass step 190, the normal event would not be logged, unless it

McDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
TELEPHONE (312) 913-0001

9

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 01-491
S/N: 09/897,518
FILING DATE: JULY 2, 2001

were logged at step 200. This transfer of control from step 180 to step 200 occurs if step 180 determines that the event condition has occurred more than n times in the preceding time period t2.

However, step 200 ignores the event for presentation purposes. Specifically, the specification on page 13, lines 23-25 states that "[a]t step 200, the program may not generate an event in response to the event condition indicated by the monitored value retrieved by step 120, but instead ignores the event condition, for presentation purposes."

Therefore, the description of steps 180, 190 and 200 of Figure 2 in the specification enables the element of claims 1 and 21 of "excluding an indication of the event from the event log display comprises excluding an indication of a normal event log entry to the event log display." As described above, the amendment to claims 1 and 21 and use of the term "normal event log entry" has antecedent basis in the specification as defined in amended claims 1 and 21 as "a log entry indicating the event does not correspond to the already recurring event." Therefore, the Applicant requests the Examiner to remove the § 112 objection to the specification.

4.   Summary of the Prior Art

      a.   Bell

Bell discloses determining the occurrence of an event, and then determining if the number of events in a given time frame exceeds a threshold. If the threshold is exceeded, the system may then take an action. "Typically, this might be the generation of a message containing parameters of interest for this type of event and the transmission of the message . . ." *See* Bell, col. 5, lines 48-51; col. 6, lines 39-42.

      b.   Andersen

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone (312) 913-0001

10

Attorney Docket No.: 01-491
S/N: 09/897,518
Filing Date: July 2, 2001

Andersen discloses sending two messages: an event message, and a corresponding repeat event message. *See* Andersen, col. 3, lines 9-13; col. 3, lines 58-62. Anderson discloses that event messages are sent to be displayed when an event is detected. *See* Anderson, col. 3, lines 9-13. Further, a given event message is sent regardless of whether the event is later determined to be a repeat event. *Id.* After the event message is sent, Andersen then determines whether the event is a repeat event. If determined to be a repeat event, a repeat event message is then sent.

Although there may be a limit as to the number of repeat event messages sent, Andersen discloses that an event message is sent when the event is detected, regardless of whether the repeat event message limit has been reached.

c.   Vaid

Vaid discloses a method for monitoring the quality of service of information sources in a network of computers. *See* Vaid, Abstract. In particular, Vaid discloses sending alarms and notifications in the form of an SNMP message. *Id.* at col. 27, lines 52-55.

5.   Response to Rejections

b.   Response to 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1, 8, 21, and 23

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1 and 21 because neither Bell nor Andersen teaches all the elements of the pending claims. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 8, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) on grounds of obviousness based on Bell, Andersen, and Vaid.

As amended, claims 1, 8, 21, and 23 recite "responsive to determining an event corresponds to an already recurring event, updating at least one existing log event entry by marking the at least existing one log event entry as recurring." Support for this amendment

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone (312) 913-0001

11

Attorney Docket No.: 01-491
S/N: 09/897,518
Filing Date: July 2, 2001

may be found generally throughout the specification, and specifically at least on page 15, lines 11-16 of the specification.

Bell does not teach this element of updating log event entries. Further, Applicant Anderson and Vaid do not cure this deficiency in Bell.

As cited by the Examiner, Anderson discloses, responsive to a determination that the event is recurring, generation of a repeat event or message. *See* Anderson, col. 3, lines 58-62. However, Anderson does not disclose updating a repeat event or message by marking an existing event or message as recurring.

Further, in at least some embodiments of Anderson, the repeat message is printed. *See* Anderson, col. 3, lines 64-67. As a printed message is typically a permanent record, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to update the printed repeat message. Clearly, Anderson did not suggest updating the existing repeat message. Therefore, Anderson does not disclose or suggest Applicant's claimed element of "responsive to determining an event corresponds to an already recurring event, updating at least one existing log event entry by marking the at least existing one log event entry as recurring."

Furthermore, Vaid fails to make up for the deficiency in Bell and Andersen. Although Vaid discloses sending notifications in the form of SNMP messages, Vaid fails to disclose the element of claim 1 "responsive to determining an event corresponds to an already recurring event, updating at least one existing log event entry by marking the at least existing one log event entry as recurring."

Given that the combination of Bell, Andersen, and Vaid fails to disclose at least the element of claim 1 of "responsive to determining an event corresponds to an already recurring event, updating at least one existing log event entry by marking the at least existing

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
TELEPHONE (312) 913-0001

12

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 01-491
S/N: 09/897,518
FILING DATE: JULY 2, 2001

one log event entry as recurring," a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the claims over the references does not exist. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 8, 21, and 23 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

b. Response to § 103(a) Rejection of Dependent Claims 4, 5, and 12-20

Without addressing the Examiner's statements regarding the pending dependent claims 4, 5, and 12-20, which are not conceded, Applicants point out that each of these claims depend from and incorporate the limitations from at least one of independent claims 1, 8, and 21, which, as discussed above, are allowable over the cited art. Accordingly, claims 4, 5, and 12-20 are allowable for at least the reason that they each depend from an allowable claim. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of the pending dependent claims.

5. Conclusion

The Applicants submit that the application is in good and proper form for allowance and respectfully request the Examiner to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at 312-913-3305.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: April 2, 2008   By: /Thomas J. Loos/
                                     Thomas J. Loos
                                     Registration No. 60,161

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone (312) 913-0001

13

Attorney Docket No.: 01-491
S/N: 09/897,518
Filing Date: July 2, 2001